

Sonderdruck aus

KRATYLOS

KRITISCHES BERICHTS-
UND REZENSIONSORGAN
FÜR INDOGERMANISCHE
UND ALLGEMEINE
SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

JAHRGANG 28

1983 [1984]

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG · WIESBADEN

Abschließend bleibt noch ein Wort des Dankes an J. Narten, die sich der mühevollen Aufgabe, die Herausgabe dieser kleinen Schriften zu übernehmen, mit Anerkennung unterzogen hat. Ihr wird sich der Benutzer für die Beifügung von „Indizes“ (655–704), die ein bequemes und schnelleres Nachschlagen ermöglichen, besonders verpflichtet fühlen. Endlich gilt es, dem Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag für die geschmackvolle Ausstattung der beiden Bände zu danken.

Weinbergsweg 64
D-6380 Bad Homburg v. d. H.

Werner Thomaš

Burrow, T[homas]: The problem of shwa in Sanskrit. Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1979, 8°, X, 130 S. Geb. 8£.

One of the basic tenets of Indo-European (= IE) phonology has been for more than a hundred years now that the weakened form of low and middle long vowels (\bar{a} , \bar{e} , \bar{o}), called shwa, was *a* in all IE languages¹ except Indo-Iranian where it appears as *i*; even the appearance of the laryngeals changed nothing in the essence of this doctrine.

The foundations of this view were first seriously challenged by Thomas Burrow, from 1944 for almost a quarter-century Boden Professor of Sanskrit in Oxford. In a paper published in 1950 (“Shwa” in Sanskrit, TPhS 1949, 22–61) he rejected the alleged implications of some of the hallowed equations of the IE lexicon such as Lat. *pater* : Skt. *pitar-*, Lat. *status* : Skt. *sthitas*, and advanced two propositions (29): first, Indian (and Iranian) *i* “has never any other origin but IE *i*”, and, second, the weakened form of Skt. \bar{a} is the same as that of $\bar{ä}$, it is elided. This means (59) that the shwa is to be abandoned altogether. This hypothesis was adopted in, and came to the notice of a wider public through, B.’s *The Sanskrit language*, 1955, 104 f. (not 164 f. as is stated here p. 2). In due course (see especially B.’s contribution to the *Kuiper Festschrift*, 1969, 247–252) a further important point was added: the “weakened” grade is represented not only by *nil* (e.g. *da-dā-mi* : *da-d-mas* “give”), the zero grade, but also by $\bar{ä}$ (e.g. *plakṣṇoti* “strikes” from *plāk-/plāg-*), the reduced grade.

¹ It is immaterial for this problem how the situation in Greek with its triple reflex is to be explained, but cf. Szemerényi, *Einführung*, 1980, 34, 82, 121 f.; and F. O. Lindeman, *The triple representation of Schwa in Greek*, Oslo 1982, 36–57 and 69 (I am greatly obliged to the author for sending me a copy of his work).

The work under review represents a synthesis of B.'s ideas about the (so-called) shwa. Chapter I (1–31) presents a succinct but nonetheless quite detailed summary of the present, or rather the definitive, version of B.'s shwa-theory. The main part of the book (chapters II–V: 32–90) shows “by the corrected interpretation of forms”, previously “wrongly explained away otherwise”, and “on the evidence of many new etymologies previously concealed by mistaken theory” that “the reduced grade of the original long vowels is in fact short *a*”; but, in addition, as in earlier papers, a true zero grade of original long vowels is also acknowledged. The distinction of two varieties of the weakened form, i.e. the (old) zero grade and the (new) reduced grade, is indeed the one major modification of the early theory, and the essential contribution of the present work. And since the reduced grade is short *a* in all IE languages, *ā* as a reduced grade “can be assigned to Indo-European, and the ... shwa (*ə*) can be dispensed with” (v–vi). Finally, Ch. VI (91–116) tries to elucidate the origin of the Sanskrit (connecting) *-i-* which was the mainstay of the shwa-theory; according to our author the Hittite evidence in particular shows that this *-i-* originated in verbs. The volume is concluded by a bibliography of the works used (117–118), and an index of the forms discussed (119–130).

The six chapters offer of course much more by way of novel explanations than would appear from this synopsis, and among them many that deserve close attention.

In Ch. I it is first of all stressed (4f). that in Sanskrit monosyllabic roots in *-ā-*, e.g. in the roots *dā-* and *dhā-*, the zero grade appears throughout the present system where *the weak form is required*: *dad(h)mas*, *dhatte*, etc., while in the perfect the connecting *-i-* is employed: *dad-iva*, *dad-ima*, *dad(h)-iṣe*, *dad(h)-ire*, etc. The zero grade further appears in the desideratives *d(h)itsati*, in the PPP *pratta-*, *devatta-* from *dā-* “give”, *avatta-* from *dā-* “cut up” and in such verbal abstracts as *bhagatti-*, *maghatti-*, *pratti-*, etc. Zero grade also appears before *y* in the opt. *jahyāt* (: *hā-* “leave”), and the presents *syati*, *chyati*, *śyati*, *dyati* (: *sā-* “bind”, *chā-* “cut”, *śā-* “sharpen”, *dā-* “bind”), in the 1. pl. pres. *śmasi* (*śā-* “declare, recite”²), before *v* in the PPA *dadvān* (RV 10, 132, 3) and *cakhvāmsam* (RV 2, 14, 4: “stretching out”? cf. Khot. *khā-* “to open”), although otherwise the PPA is formed with *-i-vas-* (e.g. *tasthivān*), in the ablaut *ā-/ə* in *ātman-/tmanā*, in IE **aner/ner-*, cf. Skt. *nar-* and the reduced grade in Greek *ἀνῆρ*.

In disyllabic bases, the full grade II (F^{II}, e.g. *trā-* from IE **terā-*) contrasts with F^I (e.g. *tari-*) where however *i* does not represent a shwa but the zero grade (e.g. *tar-*) plus the connecting *-i-*. Sanskrit shows forms with and without *i*, cf. *janīman-/janman-* “birth”, *havīman-/homan-* “invocation”; Iranian presents *i* rarely, cf. *təvīši* “strength” (Skt. *taviṣi*)³ but *draonah-* “wealth”, *mraomi* “I say”

² But see Kuiper, On Zarathustra's language, 1978, 88 (: *uš-masi*!).

³ B. thinks that Av. *zāviši* and *vaozirəm* are verbal forms with connecting *i*, but cf., for the former, Emmerick, TPhS 1966, 7f., esp. 20f. (“power”), *pace* Kuiper, IJ 18, 1976, 249f. (who disposes too easily of Emmerick's careful examination), and, for the latter, Emmerick, Saka grammatical studies, 1968, 203 (: opt. *-i-ram*); Insler, IF 73, 1969, 343f.

versus Skt. *dravinas-*, *bravīmi*. Obviously, originally the use of *i* was optional, Indo-Aryan opting mostly for, Iranian mostly against it. But it is a misconceived idea (8) to think that Iranian lost *i* in non-initial syllables: its absence is not a phonetic phenomenon (cf. *taṽiṣṭi*) but due to morphological factors⁴.

In double-zero forms (N^IN^{II}) a "residual trace" of the elided long vowel (N^{II}) "remains the most pervasive in Sanskrit, and of the greatest morphological significance" (8 f.). This trace can be seen in the lengthening of *i*, *u* before consonants (e.g. *vīṭá-* "wrapped", *hūṭá-* "invoked"), and in the case of sonant liquids in the resulting *īr*, after labials *ūr* (e.g. *tīrná-* "crossed", *pūrná-* "full"), for which the Sanskrit grammarians, and in their wake Saussure (*Mémoire* – Recueil 233) and Brugmann adopted *ī*, etc. These long sonants lose the "trace" in such languages as Avestan and Germanic⁵, but in longer forms even in Sanskrit, cp. *sūti-* "birth" but *susūti-* "easy birth".

If, then, the zero grade is nil, and the reduced grade everywhere *a*, while Indo-Iranian *i* has nothing to do with these weakenings, "the reader may ask how, if this is so, (such) a fact ... should have remained concealed for so long" (9). The answer, says B., is simple: having convinced himself that *sthitas* was completely identical with *status* and so on, all divergent evidence had to be explained by Brugmann⁶ differently; thus, e.g., *datra-* "gift" was interpreted as *d-atra-*, although *δο-τός*, *da-tus*, or *μέ-τρον* spoke unmistakably. Even those who acknowledged *a* as a zero (or reduced) grade for all languages (Pedersen and others, more recently Wyatt⁷) got bogged down in their unconvincing attempts to regard *i* as a variant development of *a*.

One environment, in which development of shwa to *a* was admitted even by Brugmann, was before the semivowels: Skt. *dhayati* "sucks", for instance, was interpreted by him as **dhayeti* (*Grundriß*² I, 171 f., 498 f.). Another interpretation offered by, e.g., B. himself (*The Sanskrit language* 330), was *dh-ayati*, i.e. *dh(ə)-ayati* with the suffix of the 10th class; B. now thinks (13) that an analysis *dha-ya-ti*, i.e. IE **dhā-ye-ti* is proved by the verbs *hvayati*, *śvayati*, *vyayati* ("call", "swell", "wrap"). For if *-aya-* had been added to a zero-grade *hū-*, etc., the result would have been **huv-aya-*, etc. (cf. *huvema*), while Vedic metre shows that these stems are disyllabic, i.e. *hvaya-*, etc. Accordingly, *dhayati* is *dha-ya-*, *dha-* being the reduced grade of IE **dhē-*. Unfortunately, B. ignores the fact – pointed out by Grassmann, Oldenberg, and recently by Kuiper (*On Zarathustra's language*, 1978, 77) – that in two passages (RV 6, 26, 19; 6, 33, 4 c) the form *huayāmasi* is to be read which vitiates the argument. Nonetheless, it is very likely (14) that beside F^I *hav-a-*, F^{II} *hvā-*, and NN *hū-* there was also (N^I) R^{II} *hūva-/hva-*.

Although B. thinks that the laryngeal theory is not directly relevant to his problem, he nevertheless adopts the variant of the theory advocated by Szemerényi (*Einführung* 131): "there was only one laryngeal ..., that which appears in Hittite as *h*. Where no *h* is found in Hittite no laryngeal should be assumed for Indo-European"; cf. *pahs-* "protect", *hant-* "front", but no laryngeal in *ais* "mouth", *es-* "be" (vi, cf. 19, 25, 31).

⁴ Against the loss of medial *i* cf. also Kuiper, *IJ* 18, 1976, 250.

⁵ According to B. (9) even in Lithuanian and Slavic but this is incorrect since Lith. *pilnas* and Oslav *plъnъ* offer a distinctive accentuation (*iĭ*, etc., as against *iĭl*, etc.), see my *Einführung*² 73 f.

⁶ See Brugmann, *Grundriß*² I, 1897, 173.

⁷ Pedersen, *KZ* 36, 1900, 85 (: nicht nötig, "neben *a* auch ein *ə* anzusetzen"); W. F. Wyatt, *Indo-European /a/*, Philadelphia 1970, see my review *Lg* 48, 1972, 165–171.

This being so, "it is a remarkable fact—notes B. (20)—that the three roots which are commonly quoted as illustrations of the three laryngeals, ... show no sign of a laryngeal ... in Hittite", cf. *dā(i)-* "place", *tiya-* "take one's stand", and *dā-* "take". An IE long vowel is reflected by vowel + *h* in Hittite in some cases (cf. *pahs-*: Skt. *pā-*, and perhaps *mehur* "time" from **meh-* = IE **mē-* "measure") but a large number of monosyllabic roots in *-ā-* show no sign of a laryngeal, cf. *hā-* "believe", *lā-* "loosen", *māi-* "grow", *pāi-* "go" (: Skt. *pā-* "go"!); etc. For Skt. *sā-/syati* "bind" B. now assumes an original root **sHā-* on account of Hitt. *ishāi*, while *ishiya-* and *sya-ti* are interpreted as based on the zero grade *sH-* with the connecting *-i-* (: **sH-i-e-ti* > *syati*).

Disyllabic roots terminating in a long vowel — which are also thought to be relevant for the laryngeal theory — are found in Hittite also, but in the few cases, in which other IE languages offer a correspondence, there is again no sign of a laryngeal; cf. *kisā(i)-* "comb" : Slavic *česati* (21), *parā(i)-* "blow, kindle" : Greek *πίμπρημι* "id.", *arā(i)-* "rise" : Skt. PPP *-īrma-*. Skt. *sū-*, *suṇāti* "impel" no doubt corresponds to Hitt. *suwa-* "push" but a reconstruction **suHāti* (cf. Mayrhofer, KEWA III 489) is not borne out by Hittite (22)⁸.

Denominative verbs formed from thematic adjectives with a laryngeal suffix do exist in Hittite and seem to correspond to Latin first conjugation verbs (cf. *newahh-* "renew" : Lat. *novāre*). But this proves nothing for the IE disyllabic bases mentioned above. The apparent exceptions, *tarh-* "overcome" and *sanh-* "strive, seek", are differently interpreted by B. (23 f.). He recognizes in Skt. *tarh-* two homonymous roots: (1) "overcome, be victorious", and (2) "cross" (see Mayrhofer, o.c., III 720); as shown by the meaning, only (1) is related to *tarh-*, and since (1) alternates with *taru-te*, *tūrv-ati*, and Hitt. *tarhu-zzi tarhu-du* (IE **terH-*/**terH-u-*)⁹, it follows that *tarh-* is not a disyllabic base but a triconsonantal root (cf. Skt. *tarp-*, *tard-*) and *tūrvati* developed from **tṛHvati*. As to *sanh-*, B. points out (24) that the comparison with Skt. *sanoti* "gains, obtains" is on semantic grounds "rather uncertain"; but if it were accepted, IE **senH-* would be (like **terH-*) a triconsonantal root, not a disyllabic base¹⁰. The problem presented by Vedic *se-* (see Mayrhofer, o.c., III 428) is, according to B., perhaps to be resolved by the assumption of a basic root *sā-/s-*; *sanoti* itself would then be a *nu*-verb from the reduced grade.

We can now (re)turn to the problem of the '(residual) trace' mentioned earlier. It is remarkable, says B. (25), that "although the reconstructed vocalic shwa had no basis in reality ..., the so-called consonantal shwa ... is based on reality, since, although it is nowhere preserved, its original presence can be deduced from its effect on adjacent phonemes". This "trace" has already been observed (see above ad p. 8 f.) in the lengthening of a preceding *i*, *u*, *ṛ*, *ḷ* to which may be added the sonant nasals (e.g. *jāta-*) and the inhibition of the change of the IE apophonic *o* to *ā*¹¹. "According to the laryngeal theory the trace present here is inherited from a variety of IE laryngeals, but in the majority of the cases involved Hittite has no *-h-*. If we assume, on the lack of evidence for them in Hittite, that there were no laryngeals in such instances, then some other explana-

⁸ B. (15 f.) also explains Av. *x^oanvainti* "they repel" as a *nu*-verb based on **swā-*, the double zero grade of this disyllabic root **sewā-*.

⁹ See also Oettinger, Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums, 1979, 220 f., 298 f.

¹⁰ Oettinger's suggestion (o.c., 182) of a present "er sucht (zu erlangen)" but aor. "er hat erlangt" is rather artificial.

¹¹ See Burrow, A new look at Brugmann's law, BSOAS 38, 1975, 55–80.

tion is necessary to account for these traces ... We can assume that when the original long vowels were reduced to the zero grade, there remained behind something in the nature of a *glottal stop* (my Italics) which was the trace remaining which produced these effects" (25). For instance, *janayati* is from *jan'-ayati*, *suṇati* from *su'-ati*, *tīrṇa-* from *tī'-no-*, *bhūta-* from *bhu'-to-*, etc. This glottal stop is not a member of the IE phonemic system but "a secondary development arising in the course of the ablaut process". In other words, there are "two 'laryngeals' (if they are so to be called) to be taken into account, one represented by Hittite *-h-* ..., preserved in the Anatolian languages but lost elsewhere, and a second, and secondary, 'laryngeal' which has arisen in the course of the ablaut process" (26).

This explanation will account for such well-known cases as the Skt. aspirates in *ahām*, *mahā-*, *duhitār-*, *panthās*, *asthi*, *sadhiṣ-*: the usually assumed laryngeal is unnecessary "since a glottal stop or the like ... could very well have the same effect" (26). Though generally clear, this explanation is more difficult to follow in the case of *asthi* where B. (27) wishes to start from IE *Hostē* whose final long vowel is reflected by *ε* in Greek *ὄστέον*, and has been reduced to the zero grade in Sanskrit where it survives in the aspiration of *t*. But I should have thought that the undeniable initial laryngeal seen in Hittite *hastāi* easily accounted (by metathesis) for *th* in *asth-*, and this *asth-*, with an indistinct murmured vowel to alleviate the final consonant cluster, developed into *asth-ə* > *asthi*¹². And in the case of *sakthi* "thigh", where B. would start from *saktā* + *i* (28) so that, with the elision of *-ā*, the aspirated *sakt-h-i* arose, one wonders why in this word the normal rule of shortening of the first vowel (*-ā-i* > *-ă-i*) found no application; I refer therefore to an earlier paper (quoted in fn. 12, there p. 524 f., 532), in which I suggested that **sak-t-*, transformed after *asth-* to *sakth-*, then developed into *sakthə* > *sakthi*.

For "daughter" B. suggests (28) that the base **dhugā-* underwent three distinct treatments before the suffix *-ter-*. In Greek *θυγάτηρ* the long vowel was reduced to *-a-*; zero grade appears in Iranian, Germanic, Balto-Slav, and Armenian; in Sanskrit, the zero grade left, before the connecting vowel *-i-*, a trace which aspirated the preceding consonant (as it did in Iranian even between consonants: *dugdar-*)¹³. For the 1st sg. pronoun B. assumes (29) a basic **egoH* seen in Greek and Latin *egō*; the *H* is also seen in the 1st sg. present ending *-hi* of the Hittite *-hi*-verbs. The addition of the suffix *-óm* led to **egH-óm*, the source of Skt. *ahām*.

On the strength of these analyses, B. concludes (29): "As can be seen from the above examples, it is usually the second, secondary, 'laryngeal' which is involved in cases where traces of laryngeals have been observed, and only comparatively rarely the IE phoneme which gave *-h-* in Hittite". Where the effect of the latter, the true laryngeal, can be observed, it is found to be the same as that of the secondary laryngeal. Thus, e.g., Skt. *tūrṇati* from **tīHvati* (cf. Hitt. *tarh-*) shows the same zero grade as *pūrva-* "former" from **pr̥'va-*, where no laryngeal can be assumed since none is present in Hitt. *parā* "in front". But "in the majority of cases ... only the secondary laryngeal is involved" (cf. *pūrṇa-*, *tīrṇa-*). After a brief discussion of Brugmann's law (see fn. 11), B. can therefore conclude (30): "it looks as if the original IE *-H-* ..., and the glottal stop arising

¹² See Szemerényi, The IE name of the heart, Festschrift C.S. Stang, 1970, 525 f., 532.

¹³ For my own view on this word see my Kinship terminology of the IE languages, 1978, 19–22.

in the way described, may at some time in the prehistory of Sanskrit have fallen together. In any event the effects of the one and the other are in all cases the same". But the main point is (31) that "it seems unnecessary to posit laryngeals in IE where none are preserved in any of the IE languages including Anatolian".

It has already been briefly reported above that Chapters II–V collect the evidence for the main theses. Ch. II (32–50) discusses the root-final *-ā* which in the reduced grade becomes *ǎ* but in the nil-grade disappears; Ch. III (51–68) assembles the evidence for *ǎ* as the reduced grade of medial *ā*. Both chapters present a mass of interesting and important cases, some of which are worth reporting.

Thus, e.g., *dhana-* "prize, wealth" is not (as Mayrhofer s.v.) "that for which one runs" (*ghan-*) but something "set up as a prize" (*dhā-*, 32–34). – The verb *pibati* "drinks" is connected with Hitt. *pas-* "swallow" but there is no laryngeal (36 f.). – The PPP *dattā-* is from **datā-* (= Lat. *datus*, *da-* being the reduced grade of *dā-*), transformed after *pratta-*, *devatta-*, etc. (37 f.). – The noun *kṣatra-* (Av. *xšaθra-*) "rule, dominion", as also *kṣayati* "he rules", is from the full grade *kṣā-* seen perhaps in OPers. *xšāyaθiya-* "king"; Greek *κράωμαι*¹⁴ is from **kstā-* (and *kṣā-* from **ktsā-*) and ultimately from **ks-tā-* < **ges-* "carry", cf. Lat. *gestāre* (40 f.). But to my mind "carry-acquire-rule" can hardly represent one root, and *xšāyaθiya-* is not from *kṣā-* but the vddhied derivative of *kṣayant*¹⁵. – Vedic *patiya-* "feed, nourish", attested in two passages, would, if real, be a cognate of Greek *πατέωμαι* "eat", Lat. *pāsko*, *pābulum*, and even of Skt. *p-i-tu-* "food", and Oslav *pitěti* "feed" (44); one could add also Gāthic *paθman-* "provisions for a journey", i.e. "food", not "viaticum"¹⁶. – Skt. (lexicographers') *snasā* "tendon, muscle", widely attested in later Indo-Aryan, is to be connected with *snāyu-* "sinew", Gk. *νεῦρον*, etc. (46): *sna-* is the reduced grade of *snā-*. – Skt. *kratu-* is not *kr-atu-* (: it would be the only example of this suffix) but *kra-tu-* which replaced nom. **krā-tu-*, derived from *kṛ-* "think on" (47)¹⁷. – Morphologically important is B.'s finding (48–50) that the *p*-causative, though "a special feature of Indo-Aryan", can go back to IE, cf. *sthāpayati* : Lithu. *stapinti* "penem erigere", *drāpayati* "make run" : *δρα-πέτης* "fugitive".

As mentioned already, Ch. III discusses the instances of *ǎ* as the reduced grade of medial *ā*. Thus, e.g., *svadati/-te* "enjoy" is not normal grade (Mayrhofer III 568 f., 804), but the reduced grade of *svādu-*, cf. the nil-grade in *sūdayati* "makes tasty" (52). – The same applies to *vagnu-* "cry, call" (: Lat. *vāgīre*) (55 f.), *vat-* "blow upon, inspire" (: IE **wāt-*, Lat. *vātēs*) (57), *bhajati* "shares" (: *bhāg-*) (58), *daśati* "bites", Gk. *δακεῖν*, cf. *δήξομαι*, *δέδηνμαί* (59 f.), *yatate* "strives after" (of which Mayrhofer "makes no mention at all" in this sense, 63) from IE **yāt-* (62). – Skt. *yakṛt* "liver" and Lat. *iecur* are said to present the reduced grade of the long vowel seen in Av. *yākara*, Gk. *ἥπαρ* (65) but the explanation of Lat. *iecin(or)* is instead of **iacinis* is unconvincing. A basic long vowel

¹⁴ Cf. Meier-Brügger, *Glotta* 56, 1979, 224–236; Peters, *Vertretung der idg. Laryngale im Griech.*, 1980, 91; Normier, *KZ* 94, 1981, 273⁸⁶; Mayrhofer, *AOAW* 119, 1982, 243.

¹⁵ See Szemerényi, *Monumentum Nyberg* II, 1975, 318 f.; Hollifield, *Sprache* 26, 1980, 176.

¹⁶ This has been suggested by Henning, *Mitteliranisch* 113.

¹⁷ But see Strunk (**kretu-*) cited by Mayrhofer III 683, and further MSS 34, 1976, 169 f.

has been postulated by others also¹⁸ but I cannot see that it is justifiable¹⁹. – For “nose” I suggested in 1970 (Einführung 110) that the nom. sg. **nās* arose in the usual way from **nas-s*. B. thinks (66) that this is unlikely since the dual is (with a word meaning “nostril”) the most commonly expected form. But in view of such well-attested singular forms as OPers. *nāh-am*, Lat. *nāris*, *nāsus*, etc., this can hardly be considered cogent. Nonetheless, I may be permitted to recall that in 1982 I myself suggested (Gedenkschrift Kronasser 233) that IE **nās*- represented an earlier **Hnā-s*.

Chapter IV (69–80) is devoted to a detailed discussion of three roots (*khād*-, *sās*-, *sādh*-) in which an (alleged) alternation *ā* : *i* led already in Sausure's *Mémoire* (see Recueil 165 f.) to the assumption of a shwa. B. tries to show that even these roots present reduced *-a-* and zero-grade nil. In Chapter V (81–90) B. discusses various suffixes such as *-ti*-, *-tha*-, *-thu*-, and concludes that the connecting *i* is never found before them, which is to be considered “strong evidence against the theory” of vocalic shwa (90).

Chapter VI (91–116) investigates the origin of this connecting *i*. On this point also a revision of earlier views is held to be indicated: the arguments used to prove that *i* originated in the nominal derivation, a view long advocated by him (e.g. *The Sanskrit language*, 1955, 186–189), are no longer regarded as convincing; our author now holds that *i* has its origin in the verbal inflexion. In particular, he accepts Meillet's view (BSL 34, 1933, 127 f.) that *-is*- in Lat. *ēg-is-ti*, Hitt. *mem-is-ta*, Skt. *agrabh-is-ta*, *kram-is-ta* is one and the same element (97 f.); clearly, *i* was first in the finite verb at home, its extension to other, even nominal forms in Sanskrit is secondary (112). As source the type *vamiti*, *aniti*, etc., is most likely which once was much more common. The ultimate origin of the connecting *i* is suggested by some facts of Hittite (113): in all probability, *i*, found as ending in the 3rd sg. of *hi*-verbs, spread to other persons, cf. 3. sg. *dāi* “place”, 2. sg. *dāitti*, 2. pl. *dāitteni*, 2. 3. sg. pret. *dāis*. In the same way, in Greek the 3. sg. *φέρει* (with *-i*) is incorporated in the 2. sg. *φέρεις*.

The connecting *i*, “so common in Sanskrit, is hardly to be found in Iranian” (115); so the process in Sanskrit is “subsequent to the separation of the two Aryan groups, and prior to the Vedic period” (116). In Indo-Iranian, *i* was confined to certain present and preterite forms from disyllabic roots. Its extension in Sanskrit to other forms took place “during the separate evolution of Indo-Aryan, but mainly in its prehistoric period” (116).

There can be no doubt that B. has collected a massive array of evidence in support of his thesis that the reduced grade of long vowels is everywhere *a* in the IE languages, and the zero grade \emptyset . This way of course to a considerable extent acknowledged by earlier scholars, cf., e.g., for *a*, Wackernagel, *Alt. Gr.* I 5 f.: a) unter dem Akzent, b) in nicht-betonter Silbe anscheinend in Folge von Akzentverschiebung²⁰, and for \emptyset , *ibid.* 81–83, but never before has the complete material been put to-

¹⁸ Cf. Meillet, *MSL* 9, 1896, 147; Leumann, *IF* 61, 1953, 8⁶; Eichner, *MSS* 31, 1973, 68 f.; Schindler, *BSL* 70, 1975, 5 f.

¹⁹ See Szemerényi, *KZ* 73, 1956, 191; *Flexion und Wortbildung*, 1975, 332–334; cf. also Rix, *MSS* 18, 1965, 87.

²⁰ Note also more recently Tischler, *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*, 1980, 512 f.; and *Essays in Memory of J. A. Kerns I*, 1981, 311–323.

gether in such an impressive fashion. And as a matter of fact I am ready to admit that this first point of B.'s theory can hardly be faulted, and even the assumption of two different manifestations (or stages?) of weakening is within the bounds of historical verisimilitude, but see below.

But a serious problem is presented by the forms with *i*, although the correlation \tilde{a}/i is infrequent, at any rate not as frequent as one is led to believe by the constant repetition of the shwa-thesis, and oddly enough is, at least in the Sanskrit synchrony, only found in the finals of verbal roots, not in nominal roots or suffixal elements²¹. B.'s explanation, however, does not seem to be satisfactory, it often leads to unnatural cuts (cf. *p-i-tar-*, *sth-i-ta-*, etc.), and is semantically inadequate.

No doubt some (or many?) alleged instances can, even must, be explained differently from what is usually offered. Thus, e.g., the oft-repeated equation *isira-* : *ἰερός* is not to be traced to IE **isāros* but, as I have shown recently²², to IE **isiros* which in different Greek dialects variously developed into *i(h)iros* > *īros*, or to dissimilated *i(h)eros*, and from this into Doric *hiaros*. – The Aryan form of “father” cannot possibly be *p-i-tar-*, with zero grade of *pā-* “protect” and a meaningless *-i-* before the suffix (8,97). If the reconstruction of IE (!) **pā-ter-* is taken seriously, then Aryan *pi-* must be an Aryan modification, and I have indeed suggested (Kinship terminology 10¹⁷) that the modification was due to the influence of the most significant term in the father's orbit, i. e. *pitu-* “food”. – Since all non-Aryan languages preserve **statos*, one must ask why – if B.'s *ā*-thesis is correct – this form was not kept in Sanskrit. It must have been transformed – but transformed after what? Was it after the noun *-sthi-* (like *hi-ta-* after *-dhi-*)? Here at last we would find a glimmer of hope for a rational explanation: beside root-nouns like *sthā-*, *dhā-* there was also with *-i-* suffix *sth-i-*, *dh-i-*²³. And in the case of *asthāt* : *asthita*, where the latter form presupposes the nil-grade (that is in all probability *sth-*), we could assume that *a-sth-ta* developed by anaptyxis to *asth-i-ta*²⁴. – Since B. regards the alternation *i/ī* as frequently occurring, I must point out that one case at any rate is proved to be IE by the evidence of Greek. The verb “to drink” is widely attested as **pō-*, cf. Lat. *pōtus*, *pōtiō*, etc., Greek *πώνω*, Hitt. *pa-s-*, etc. The IE thematic present **pibeti* (attested by Latin, Celtic, Indic) can, in

²¹ Cf. Renou, *Grammaire de la langue védique*, 1952, 26.

²² See Szemerényi, *SMEA* 20, 1979, 207–211, accepted by Lindeman, *Triple representation*, 1982, 45. The alleged “Nachteile” of this explanation (so Peters, o.c. above fn. 14, 325) seem to be river-names only, that is to say non-existent.

²³ See Wackernagel-Debrunner, *AI. Gr. II* 2, 1954, 24 and 299 f. (where the relation is mistakenly regarded as one between full and nil grades).

²⁴ Cf. Tischler's explanation of *mā-* : *mita-*, etc., o.c. at fn. 20 above, p. 321 f.

spite of difficulties, reflect an IE **pi-p-eti*. But there is also Greek *πίνω*, with *ī*. It seems to me that rather than derive from an unnecessary *pōi-*, this could represent a reduplicated **pi-p-nō* which, via **pibnō*, **pimnō* developed into **pīnō*, supplying also the aoristic *ἔπιον*. Aryan and Balto-Slav *pī-* show that the reduplicated form was general IE, not just Greek. – Last not least Greek *ποιμήν* “shepherd”, Lithu. *piemuos* should be mentioned where B. (17) is inclined to see the incremental or connecting *i* (**poH-i-mēn*, cf. Hitt. *pah-s-*). But this would again leave *i* without any visible function. I wonder therefore whether the analysis should rather be based on IE **pōyu-* “herd”, attested by *πῶν*. A compound or derivative **pōyu-mēn* could have led to syncopated **pōymēn*, later **poimēn*.

These instances are only meant to show how *i*, if one is ready to give up the old shwa-theory, can find rational explanations. But it is clear that a convincing solution of this (side-)problem presupposes a collection and critical examination of all the instances which so far have been regarded as exhibiting the development of shwa into *i*. B. would obviously bring the best possible qualifications for such a difficult task.

As concerns the ‘(residual) trace theory’ (cf. above ad p. 8 f., 25 f.), there are several points to note. As is rightly stressed by B. (9), if the trace is related to *i*, why is it that the PPP of “fill” is *pūrṇa-*, not **prīṇa-*? This question had of course been raised very early by Cuny, and emphatically restated by Cowgill²⁵: if the weakened grade of the long vowels had simply been a short vowel of indeterminate quality, i. e. *a*, then the reduced grade of a root **pelē-* would have been expected as **plā-nó-* in the PPP, i. e. **prīṇa-* in Sanskrit, not *pūrṇa-*. According to B. (25,31) the explanation is not to be sought in an ill-supported laryngeal but in the peculiar nature of the weakened long vowel which was something like a glottal stop. But it is high time to point out that it is not necessary at all that the weakened form of a base **sterē-* or **pelē-* should appear as **stṛə-* or **pḷə-* (or **stṛH-* or **pḷH-*). It is much more likely that **sterē-*, **pelē-* were weakened to **stVrV-*, **pVlV-* which gave **stirina-*, and, under the influence of the labial, **puluna-* in the PPP, and eventually *stīrṇa-*, *pūrṇa-*. A useful parallel is provided by the Hittite equivalent of Skt. *dīrgha-* “long”: IE **dVlVgh-* gave **dirigh-* in Proto-Sanskrit, and later *dīrgh-*, but **duluk-is* in Hittite²⁶ which was dissimilated to **dolukis*, and eventually developed into the historical *dalukis*, so puzz-

²⁵ See Cowgill, in: Evidence for laryngeals (ed. W. Winter), 1965, 144; Szemerényi, BSL 68, 1973, 13; Lindeman, o.c. (above fn. 1), 13.

²⁶ This development would be in accord with the development sought by me for the syllabic liquids at KZ 73, 1955, 71 f., and is supported by other instances as I hope to show elsewhere.

ling at first sight. The solution of the difficult problem posed by the long sonants is therefore not a glottal stop (or some other laryngealist device) but the weakening of, e.g., *elē* to *VlV*, and a subsequent development to *ili*, *ulu*, or *ala*, resulting in the end in *īl*, *ūl*, or *āl/lā*, etc.; note for this the equivalence seen in Greek *αρα/ρᾱ*, *αυα/υᾱ*, *ερε/ρη̄*, etc.

A further important question raised by B.'s theory is why reduced and nil-grade, that is two different manifestations (see above ad p. 8), should appear side by side. Although I have said above that such an assumption is within the bounds of historical verisimilitude, it would still be important to find the principle governing this division. Could it depend on syllabic structure, that is on the difference of open and close syllables?

For the optative forms used in the Avesta as preterites (*xšayōi*, *avaē-nōi*, etc.) B. offers (94) a novel explanation since although they "are indistinguishable from optatives, ... the different meaning ... demands a different explanation". This is provided by the incremental (= connecting) *ī*—a variant of the more frequent *i*—which could be combined with the *-a-* of thematic stems to produce preterites with *-ai-* before the termination; B. thinks (94) that "one verbal form in Sanskrit ... can be compared with the above Avestan forms, namely *āsaparyait* in AV. 14,2,20" though "some difficulty is caused by ... the *vṛddhi* diphthong". It is surprising that B. does not know that another unique form had been discovered by Pisani more than half-a-century ago in the *Mahābhārata* (IF 50, 1932, 21–22) but interpreted as a true optative, and, as Edgerton noted (Lg 38, 1962, 357⁷), the phenomenon is quite common in Middle Indian and so also in the *Mahābhārata*. But even more remarkable is the fact that B. does not seem to be aware that this usage of the optative has been repeatedly discussed with reference to Iranian; cf., e.g., Tedesco, ZII 2, 1923, 298–301; Bailey, TPhS 1945, 35; Benveniste, *ibid.* 50 f., and BSL 47, 1951, 11–20; Dresden, Henning Memorial, 1970, 136–139; Szemerényi, Einführung, 1970, 242–243 and Note (5); K. Hoffmann, Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik 2, 1976, 605–619; Lazard, Mélanges Benveniste, 1975, 347–358, and quite recently at the Colloque Benveniste in Tours (Sept. 1983).

Finally, one must ask whether the connecting *i*, if it is an *i*, can really be equated with the Hittite 3. sg. ending (*dā*)*i*. Oettinger's *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* was also published 1979, and so was not accessible to B. in time. But his statement (460): "Für den Ausgang °*āi* der Prs. Sg. 3. ist nur eine Herleitung aus Perfektstämmen möglich" assumes much more than the subsequent application: "So ist z. B. ... *dāi* 'er setzt' aus *(*d^he-*)*d^hóh₁-ej* 'er hat gesetzt' erklärbar" (cf. also 482–483 with fn. 64). But even if Oettinger's explanation should

prove to be not as solidly established as is claimed, it shows that B.'s own interpretation needs a lot more support than he has been able to produce so far²⁷.

Seminar für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität
Belfortstraße 18
D-7800 Freiburg i. Br.

Oswald Szemerényi

Narten, Johanna: Die Aməša Spəntas im Avesta. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1982, gr.-8°, XII, 155 S. Brosch. 68 DM.

Die *Aməša Spəntas* des Avesta (im folgenden *Am. Sp.*) waren schon früher Gegenstand von Untersuchungen, und neuerdings wurden sie in persönlicher Weise behandelt von M. Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism*. I–II, Leiden-Köln 1975–1982 (= Handbuch der Orientalistik I, 8,1,2, 2A).

Die Verf.in will jedoch „unter Verzicht auf eine zusammenhängende Darstellung der Forschungsgeschichte“ (XI) die Sekundärliteratur nur dann – und zwar nur in den Anmerkungen – erwähnen bzw. behandeln, wenn in ihr „neue, gegebenenfalls über Bartholomae hinausreichende philologisch begründete Textinterpretationen zur Diskussion gestellt werden“ (XII). Damit übt sie implizite herbe und vielfach berechnete Kritik an ihren Vorgängern, doch scheut sie andererseits vor einer offenen und erfrischenden wissenschaftlichen Konfrontation so sehr zurück, daß sie es sogar vermeidet, ihre eigene Position klar zu umreißen. So unterläßt sie es auch, am Ende der einzelnen Abschnitte wie an dem des ganzen Buchs die wichtigeren der nach ihrer Ansicht gewonnenen Erkenntnisse klar aufzusummieren. Da das Buch allein schon durch seine zahlreichen und komplizierten, für das Thema nicht immer relevant erscheinenden philologischen Diskussionen recht unübersichtlich geworden ist, ist deshalb seine Lektüre und Auswertung eine unerwartet schwierige Sache.

Abgesehen von dem zentralen Problem, „welche Stellung die Aməša Spəntas im System der Religion Zarathustras oder seiner Nachfolger

²⁷ Of the few misprints I have noted the following might be useful to the reader: p. 2 line 3: read 104 ff.; p. 3 line 27 and p. 9 line 5 from the bottom read „simplification“; p. 9 line 18 read „nothing“; p. 61 line 6 read „Hindi“, line 28 read „śāsā-“; p. 76 line 16 read „āśā“, line 18 read „same way“; p. 81 line 1 read „full grade I“; p. 127 second column line 8 from the bottom read „46“.